



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,473	11/02/2001	Haiyan He	US 010003	6770

24737 7590 03/24/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

DESIRE, GREGORY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/004,473

Applicant(s)

HE ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory M. Desire

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/02/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 12-14, 23-25 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja et al (5,815,596) in view of Enomoto et al.

Regarding apparatus, method, system and computer medium claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 Ahuja discloses,

A boundary detection controller capable of detecting a boundary in vector sequence having arbitrary dimension by selecting a function to represent a modified first order difference vector of said vector sequence, denoted, wherein said function is dependent upon a frequency characteristic of said vector sequence (note col. 7 lines 44-65, a Gaussian function is selected resulting in spatial frequency).

Wherein said boundary controller is capable of operating upon said modified first order difference vector with a length operator to obtain a scalar value (computes scalar quantity not col. 13 line 29) that represents a value of a change in said vector sequence at point n and detecting a local maximum of said scalar value (note col. 13 lines 29-32, scalar value has a local maximum and vector change is used to examine boundary);

Art Unit: 2625

and However, Ahuja does not disclose determining whether said local maximum of said scalar value is larger than a predetermined threshold value. Enomoto discloses that comparing value to a predetermined threshold corrects estimated values (note col. 6 lines 30-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to determine if said scalar value is larger than a predetermined threshold value. Correcting values would have been a highly desirable feature in the edge analysis art due to its processing function and Enomoto recognizes that correcting value would be expected when determining if said scalar value is larger than a predetermined threshold value is applied to Ahuja.

Regarding apparatus, method, system and computer medium claims 2, 13, 25 and 35 Ahuja and Enomoto discloses,

Selecting point n as an edge point when said local maximum of said scalar value is larger than said predetermined threshold value (note Enomoto col. 2 lines 55-66).

3. Claims 3, 14, 25 and 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja and Enomoto in further view Yokoyama (5,646,691).

Regarding apparatus, method, system and computer medium claims 3, 14, 25 and 36 Ahuja and Enomoto, silent disclosing vector sequence is in Euclidean space and said length operator has the form of an equation. However, Yokoyama discloses Euclidean space for correct initial point allocation of a contour line (note col. 14 lines 5-65). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2625

time of the invention was made to include sequence in Euclidean space in the system of Ahuja and Enomoto. Correcting initial point allocation would have been highly desirable feature in the contour analysis art due to its processing function and Yokoyama recognizes that correcting initial point allocation would be expected when Euclidean distance is computed in the system of Ahuja and Enomoto.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 4-11, 15-22, 26-33 and 36-44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory M. Desire whose telephone number is (703) 308-9586. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) Second Monday off.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory M. Desire
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

G.D.
March 14, 2005



BHAVESH M. MEHTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600